

## REMARKS

By the present amendment, Claims 6 and 14 have been amended. Claims 6 and 9-17 are pending in the application, with Claims 6, 12 and 14 being the independent claims. Claims 6, 9-11, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smethers (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,640 B2) in view of Mintz (U.S. Patent No. 6,250,930 B1).

Applicant appreciates the indication by the Examiner that Claims 12, 13 and 15 are allowed, and Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

To further distinguish Claims 6 and 14 over Smethers and Mintz, independent Claim 6 has been amended to recite, in part, selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks from a bookmark list, wherein each bookmark includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field for saving an address of an Internet resource and a browser ID field for saving a browser ID used to select a corresponding browser from the plurality of browsers capable of browsing the Internet resource having a unique protocol, and independent Claim 14 has been amended to recite, in part, a memory for storing a bookmark frame including a browser ID (identification) field and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field on a bookmark list.

Conventional browsers such as Microsoft Explorer and Netscape Navigator include a bookmark function that allows individual web pages to be bookmarked in a bookmark list. The URL for a particular web page is cached in the bookmark list so an associated web page can be readily accessed on subsequent occasions. Conventional bookmark lists are formatted in a browser-specific manner. For example, Microsoft Explorer has a bookmark list called Favorites formatted in a certain manner. Web pages can only be added to Favorites when Microsoft Explorer is activated. Favorites does not include web pages associated with other browsers.

The Examiner concedes that Smethers does not teach that a plurality of browsers may be referenced from the proxy server 116. The Examiner relies on Mintz, col. 5, lines 24-52, col. 6,

lines 49-64, and col. 7, lines 58-65, for satisfying the deficiencies of Smethers, and asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the launching of a browser taught by Smethers to include a launch from a particularly-specified browser process as in Mintz.

Smethers describes remote bookmarking for wireless client devices. Smethers operates an HDML browser and stores URLs of bookmarks for a wireless client device on a proxy server, where each URL is associated with a device identifier associated with the wireless device. The wireless client device can display a list of bookmarks using the HDML browser. The proxy server provides the list of bookmarks in HDML format so the wireless client device can display the list of bookmarks.

Mintz describes a multi-functional communication and aggregation platform. The Mintz platform is a tool to assist in the conduct of sophisticated opinion surveys, optionally including multimedia elements, using email as the transport mechanism. The Mintz platform includes an e-Logic Authoring and Editing Engine and a Web Command Launcher. Mintz creates an enhanced email message with embedded multimedia inclusions using the e-Logic Authoring and Editing Engine. The Web Command Launcher provides centralized control of multiple web-browser windows embedded within the enhanced email message. Mintz nowhere describes creating or providing a bookmark list with bookmarks associated with various browsers.

In contrast, bookmarks of the present invention are associated with various browsers and are stored in a bookmark list. When a user selects a bookmark from the bookmark list, a terminal automatically selects a corresponding browser and browses the intended information. The bookmark list of the present invention includes bookmarks from various browsers and is not browser-specific.

One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Smethers with the teachings of Mintz to arrive at the recitations in Claims 6 and 14 because Smethers is associated with remote bookmarking for wireless client devices, and Mintz is associated with a multi-functional communication and aggregation platform. Any motivation to combine the teachings of Smethers and Mintz would only result in providing Smethers with the ability to

provide an enhanced email message with embedded multimedia inclusions using an e-Logic Authoring and Editing Engine, where a Web Command Launcher would provide centralized control of multiple web-browser windows embedded within the enhanced email message.

Smethers, Mintz, or any combination thereof, fails to teach or reasonably suggest all of the recitations included in independent Claims 6 and 14. For example, Smethers, Mintz, or any combination thereof, fails to teach or reasonably suggest selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks from a booklist, wherein each bookmark includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field for saving an address of an Internet resource and a browser ID field for saving a browser ID used to select a corresponding browser from the plurality of browsers capable of browsing the Internet resource having a unique protocol, as recited in Claim 6, and a memory for storing a bookmark frame including a browser ID (identification) field and a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field on a bookmark list, as recited in Claim 14.

Furthermore, Smethers, Mintz, or any combination thereof, fails to teach or reasonably suggest the “browser ID” recited in the claims. Smethers says nothing about a browser ID, and Mintz merely discusses general bookmarks as opposed to bookmarks including a browser ID.

Accordingly, Claims 6 and 14 are allowable over Smethers, Mintz, or any combination thereof.

While not conceding the patentability of the dependent claims, *per se*, Claims 9-11 and 17 are also allowable for at least the above reasons.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 6 and 9-17, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/TCS/dr